a certain land. The land remains in the possession of the owner and an order is passed by Government as to what compensation is payable to him thereon. If the man appeals to a civil court against this order, it is not his fault. His complaint is that Government do not pay him sufficiently, and if, as he alleges, Government have not satisfied his claim, they have to be dragged to court and compelled to pay his cost. In suits arising from settlement decisions, the dispute is between party and party in substance. It is therefore not expedient to exempt such suits altogether from court-fees. But in view of the fact that they are rendered necessary by the decisions of registering officers passed at the spot, in many cases upon summary enquiry, some concession might be shown. A party goes or is dragged to court only on some incidental question of title negatived by the settlement officer. Government accordingly propose to consider the feasibility of modifying the Court-fees Regulation (I of 1062) by providing a moderate fixed fee for suits to set aside pattahs. In British India, Rs. 10 is the sum fixed for such declaratory suits. Some such provision will be adopted here also.

71. Amendment of the Jenmi and Kudiyan Regulation (V of 1071).

Mr. T. Vasudevan Potti of Vilavancode (*Nominated*), *Mr. Aiyappan Pillai* (*Vycome*), *Mr. Thuppan Thuppan Namburipad* (*Kunnatnad*), *Mr. K. Narayanan Namburipad of Muvattupuzha* (*Nominated*) *and Mr. Narayanan Jatavedar Namburipad* (*Muvattupuzha*) prayed for the amendment of the Jenmi and Kudiyan Regulation embodying the existing practice in Cochin and British Malabar.

Reply.—This Regulation was only recently passed on the report of a special commission and there are no reasons to interfere with it now.

72. Repeal of clause (2) of Section 5 of the Hindu Religious Endowments Regulation (III of 1079).

Mr. Narayanan Jatavedar Namburipad (*Muvattupuzha*) represented that the provision sought to be now repealed worked considerable hardship on the proprietors of Devaswoms.

Reply.—This Regulation was very recently passed and no reasons are assigned for modifying it now.

73. Permission to apply for the refund of the value of spoilt stamps through the Tahsildars instead of direct to the Dewan Peishkars.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. N. Padmanabha Pillai (*Chengannur*) represented that applications for refund of the value of spoilt stamps had now to be made to the Dewan Peishkars and this meant trouble and pecuniary loss to parties. He suggested that it would be a convenience if permission could be granted to make such applications through Tahsildars, the final disposal alone being allowed to rest with the Peishkars as hitherto, if deemed necessary.

Mr. K. Kochu Thomman (*Chengannur*) spoke in support.

Reply.—The provisions of section 51 of the Stamp Regulation (IV of 1080) do not seem to require that such applications should be presented to the Peishkars themselves, nor is it clear whether applications made through Tahsildars could not be disposed of by the Peishkars. It is, however, open to the parties in all cases to present applications to Peishkars by post. There is provision in the section for framing rules as to enquiry, and if it is seen that the section cannot be interpreted in the sense in which the member wants it, the question of passing a rule enabling parties to present such applications through Tahsildars will be considered.

74. Repeal of Civil Circular No. 30 of 1079 prohibiting parties who have engaged vakils from conducting cases in their absence.

Mr. N. Madhavan Valiathan (*Tiruvallah*) observed that the present rule was that a party who had retained a vakil to appear for him could not be heard in person before he terminated the engagement as provided for by section 29 of the Vakils' Regulation. This provision caused unnecessary delay and additional expenditure to the litigants. Parties enjoyed this privilege before the passing of the circular, which, the member thought, did not serve any useful purpose. He requested that the circular might be repealed.

Mr. N. Kesavan Valiathan (*Kartigapalli*) also spoke on the subject.

Reply.—This matter has to be considered from the standpoint of the pleader, the court and the party. Pleaders, of course, will not tolerate the proposed amendment, because that would leave it to the caprice of the party to cancel his engagement with them at any moment he chooses. As for the court, it cannot but be inconvenienced by such abrupt termination. In the case of the party, he has the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly